



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

attitude of Pliny the Elder. To him the Greeks are genus in gloriam suam effusissimum (3.42). Their credulity is unbounded (8.82), and their mendacity is *portentosa* (5.4). Their *fabulae* (5.31), and their *fabulositas* (4.1; 12.11) are equally remarkable. He gives them their full due (2.248), Neque enim subtraham exemplum vanitatis Graecae maximum, and follows this with the story written to his friends on earth by the dead Dionysodorus. All these expressions illustrate *ingenium Romanum*, and become the more interesting when we consider that Pliny himself quotes many an item from Onesicritus, of whom Strabo says (15.1.28 698 C), 'One might call him not more the chief pilot of Alexander than of paradoxes, for he seems to surpass all in wonderology'.

IV

Quintilian (10.1.96) expresses this opinion:

At lyricorum idem Horatius fere solus legi dignus, nam et insurgit aliquando et plenus est iucunditatis et gratiae et variis figuris et verbis felicissime audax.

Audax is one phase of *virtus*, but *gratia* is a Grecian characteristic, as is shown by the contrast in Seneca (Dialogues 11.2.6), Aut Latinae linguae potentia aut Graecae gratia. If we could find the literary measure of *potentia* and *gratia*, it would determine the fundamental difference between the Greek and the Roman. If we take some of the lines which the Romans themselves selected as fittingly expressing their *potentia*, we can feel how little *gratia* there was in them. Take for example the line from Ennius,

Unus homo nobis cunctando restituit rem

which was quoted by Cicero, Cato Maior 10, and reproduced with slight variations in Vergil, Aeneid 6.846, or that other line which to Cicero sounded like an oracle (De Republica 5.1).

Moribus antiquis res stat Romana virisque.

Or better still, as an extended illustration, take Horace, Carm. 3.30, beginning Exegi monumentum aere perennius. It is as solid and as bare of ornamentation as are the pyramids themselves, and could be used as a good illustration of what Professor Shorey (Horace, Odes and Epodes, Introduction, xx) has called "poverty of epithet". Lucretius (1.136; 1.830; 3.259) speaks of *patrii sermonis egestas*, and this is echoed by Manilius (2.695; 2.897; 3.41; 5.647). But, even if we admit the charge, it applies only to a few points. For an antithetic statement of generic differences, let us take a few of the statements of Quintilian where he discusses *illam gratiam sermonis Attici* (12.10.36):

Non possumus esse tam graciles: sinus fortiores. Subtilitate vincimur: valeamus pondere. Proprietates penes illos est certior: copia vincamus. Ingenia Graecorum etiam minora suos portus habent: nos plerumque maioribus velis moveamur, validior spiritus nostros sinus tendat; non tamen alto semper feramur, nam et litora interim sequenda sunt. Illis facilis per quaelibet vada accessus: ego aliquid, non multo tamen, altius, in quo mea cymba non sidat, inveniam.

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY,
Nashville, Tennessee.

R. B. STEELE.

REVIEW

How to Observe in Archaeology. Suggestions for Travellers in the Near and Middle East. London: Printed by Order of the Trustees of the British Museum. Oxford University Press (1920). Pp. 103. 2 sh., 6d.

This little book is prepared in a convenient size and form and with a flexible cover so that it can be carried easily in the pocket, and is intended "primarily for the use of travellers . . . who are interested in antiquities without being already trained archaeologists" (5). It is "not meant for experienced archaeologists" (7). Moreover, since it is intended chiefly for English travelers, three pages (26-28) are devoted to a list of the names of the British Archaeological Joint Committee and to a List of the Chief British Institutions and Societies Concerned with the Archaeology of the Near and Middle East. But, as American students are invariably afforded the privileges of British institutions, this fact does not limit its usefulness to travelers from the United States.

The chapters are written by various distinguished English scholars who are masters of their subjects. After the brief Preface, by Sir F. G. Kenyon, and the Introductory Chapter, by G. F. Hill, comes a valuable chapter (II:10-25) on Method, by W. M. Flinders Petrie, in which are also included some important observations on photography, by professional photographers. This chapter is a short abstract of Petrie's book, Methods and Aims in Archaeology, but even a traveler untrained in archaeology would be well advised to take Petrie's book itself rather than rely on the brief outline here given.

Part II of the book (29-94) begins with a chapter on prehistoric flint implements, in which the flints are described and illustrated. This is followed by Chapter II (35-46) on Greece Proper, written by J. P. Droop. In a methodical way the objects characteristic of the important periods and places are briefly described and there is a double page illustration of the types of pottery, and tables showing the many forms of letters which constitute the Greek alphabets of the various periods. This chapter particularly well satisfies the end in view, as much useful information is presented in a clear, convenient, usable form.

On the other hand the next chapter, on Asia Minor, seems to me to be the least satisfactory in the book. The whole subject is condensed into four printed pages and in these pages there is little that can be used either by archaeologist or by casual traveler. To one who has worked in Lydia and is familiar with the artificial burial mounds that rise conspicuously in all directions on the plains, attracting inevitably the interest of all travelers, it is incredible that they should not be mentioned among the monuments of Asia Minor. It is also strange to find no reference to the peculiarly characteristic Lydian pottery, and, in view of the many beautifully executed inscriptions in the Lydian language, found at

Sardes and published in part in 1916, it seems indeed inadequate to devote to the subject of Lydian inscriptions merely the words "letters mostly like Greek capitals (sometimes reversed)". With several exceptions the letters do not at all resemble Greek capitals, and such a description, while it might not mislead the archaeologist, certainly would not assist the layman in the recognition of a Lydian inscription. This chapter should be improved by a statement of the characteristic monuments that the traveler will be certain to see and visit, by a fuller account of the pottery peculiar to the country, and by the reproduction of at least one Lydian and one Lycian inscription. With such additions it would prove more useful to the visitor to Asia Minor and would be of greater value to the archaeological student.

The chapter on Cyprus (IV) is brief (54-58), but the reader is at once referred to the catalogues of the Cyprus Museum, and of the Cypriote collection in the Metropolitan Museum, and, as no intelligent traveler would visit Cyprus without one or both of these works in his equipment, sufficient space is here devoted to the subject.

Chapter VI, on Palestine, and Chapter VIII, on Mesopotamia, are particularly good. In both are briefly listed the visible monuments which should receive the traveler's attention, and both give the periodology of their respective civilizations, with an account of the objects characteristic of each period.

The chapter on Egypt (VII) is so concise as to be of little practical value. The book is concluded with an Index, which is preceded by an Appendix, in which is given an abstract of the laws of antiquities at present in force in Greece, Turkey, Cyprus, and Egypt, together with an outline of a model law of antiquities proposed by an International Committee in Paris for the provinces formerly under Turkish rule.

This book will be carried and used by visitors to the Near East, but its value would be greatly enhanced, without the size becoming burdensome, by an enlargement of several of the chapters, and by an increase in the number of illustrations.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

T. LESLIE SHEAR.

HORACE, ODES 4.6.1-28

Another Study in Punctuation

Professor Knapp's demonstration, in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 14.73, of the correct punctuation of the opening sentence of Lucretius's famous philosophic poem impels me to call attention to a similar phenomenon in the fine ode (4.6), in which Horace invokes divine aid

for the writing of the Carmen Saeculare. The text, with the correct punctuation, is as follows:

- Dive, quem proles Niobeae magnae
vindicem linguae Tityosque raptor
sensit et Troiae prope victor altae
Phthius Achilles,
5 ceteris maior, tibi miles impar,
filius quamvis Thetidis marinae
Dardanas turris quateret tremenda
cuspidē pugnae—
ille, mordaci velut icta ferro
10 pinus aut impulsā cupressus Euro,
procidit late positūque collum in
pulvere Teucro;
ille non inclusus equo Minervae
sacra mentito male feriatos
15 Troas et laetam Priami choreis
falleret aulam;
sed palam captis gravis, heu nefas, heu,
nescios fari pueros Achivis
ureret flammis, etiam latentem
20 matris in alvo,
ni tuis victus Venerisque gratae
vocibus divom pater adnuisset
rebus Aeneae potiore ductos
alite muros—
25 doctor argutae fidicen Thaliae,
Phoebe, qui Xantho lavis amne crinis,
Dauniae defende decus Camenae,
levis Agyieū.

It is unessential whether lines 9 to 24 be set off with dashes, with parentheses, or with colons; the point is that they form a parenthetical adornment, describing Achilles, who has been spoken of in verses 3-8. An examination of editions by over forty editors, American, English, French, and German, shows a great preponderance for the period as punctuation after 8, 12, 24. But any scrutiny of the poem makes it evident that there is no principal verb with which the opening vocative *Dive* can be associated, until the seventh stanza is reached; in it the vocative is repeated, and then *defende*, the main verb of the sentence, follows.

Among American editions, only those of C. L. Smith and C. H. Moore make verses 9-24 parenthetical. Among the Teubner text editions there is a variation. Those of Jahn-Schmid (1851) and Nauck (1856) set off 9-24 between dashes, that of L. Müller (1899) puts periods after 8, 12, and 24; that of Vollmer (1906) returns to the (correct) punctuation of Jahn-Schmid and Nauck. Stallbaum and Bond, in their editions, put a colon after 8, but set periods after 12 and 24. There is one curious variation, that of Kiessling³ (1898), who puts a colon after 5, a comma after 8, a semicolon after 12, commas after 16 and 20, and a colon after 24: thus while he recognizes the parenthetical nature of 9-24, he includes with it 6-8, making the *quamvis*-clause qualify *procidit*, 11, rather than *impar*, 5.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

ROLAND G. KENT.